

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated May 8, 2006 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Regarding the objections to Claim 1, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to remove the article “the” before the word “contents” in line 1 and to change the spelling of “initialization”. These changes are believed to overcome the objections to the claim; therefore, Applicant requests that the objections be removed.

Regarding Claim 10, Applicant has amended the claim to address the spelling of the word “initialization.” This change is believed to overcome the objection, and Applicant requests that the objection be removed.

Regarding the objection to Claim 6, Applicant has amended the claim to address a typographical error. The term “the fist” has been changed to “the first”. This change is believed to overcome the objection, and Applicant requests that the objection be removed.

Claims 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended Claims 16 and 17 to be directed to a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions. Such a computer-readable medium constitutes statutory subject matter as it is directed to a practical application of comparing checksum values and in response causing memory components to correspond to each other. *See, e.g.*, MPEP §2106(IV)(B)(2)(b). Applicant accordingly submits that Claims 16 and 17 are directed to statutory subject matter and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant has amended each of the independent claims, Claims 1, 10, 13 and 16 to further characterize that the claimed memory components are physical memory components. The term “physical” being used to contrast “logical” or “virtual” memory components. Support for these changes may be found in the instant Specification, for example, at page 5, lines 5-8; page 6, paragraph [0028], and page 8, lines 3-12. The independent claims have also been amended to remove references to “device identifiers”

such that a comparison is made between checksum values and updating of memory component contents is done as a result of the comparison of checksum values. The dependent claims have been amended to be consistent with the independent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that each of Claims 1-17 is patentable over Fox because Fox does not teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. For example, Fox does not disclose comparing first checksum values and second checksum values with each other and causing the contents of physical memory components to correspond to each other as a response to the first checksum values or the second checksum values not corresponding to each other, as claimed. Applicant fails to recognize where Fox teaches the claimed physical memory components. Also, Fox teaches that if beginning checksums do not match, a database is only analyzed to determine whether synchronization is possible. *See, e.g.,* column 7, line 65-column 8, line 1. As each of the independent claims includes limitations as discussed above, Fox fails to correspond to each of the independent claims. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the §102(b) rejection is improper and should not be maintained. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 17 depend from independent Claims 1, 10, 13 and 16, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fox. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, these rejections are also improper for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 10, 13 and 16. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited references. Therefore, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 17 is also improper.

Applicant has added new Claim 18 to further characterize the invention. Support for this claim may be found in the instant Specification, for example, at paragraphs [0031] – [0037] and Fig. 3. Thus, new Claim 18 does not introduce new matter to the application and is believed to be patentable over the cited reference for the reasons discussed above in connection with the independent claims.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOLS.082PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at the number below to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700

Date: September 8, 2006

By: *Erin M. Nichols*

Erin M. Nichols  
Reg. No. 57,125